

**To:** CN=Karen Schwinn/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Tom Hagler/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Erin Foresman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Tom Hagler/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Erin Foresman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Erin Foresman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]  
**Cc:** CN=Laura Fujii/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]  
**From:** CN=Carolyn Yale/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US  
**Sent:** Mon 5/9/2011 4:46:47 PM  
**Subject:** redirected impacts in BDCP (for example)

I happened upon an exchange (posted online, as G. Meral as reponse to a host of 'upstream' water users arguing for 'no redirected impacts' from Delta solutions. [See [http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/News/Northern\\_California\\_Coalition\\_response\\_4\\_27\\_11\\_sflb.sflb.ashx](http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/News/Northern_California_Coalition_response_4_27_11_sflb.sflb.ashx)]

I don't recall the exact context for the CALFED ROD "no redirected impacts policy" that is cited. However, insofar as it might be applied to efforts to spread the responsibilities for water inflow to the Delta, I think you can anticipate the likely debate....

Also, this points to possible difficulties with impact baselines. I'd cast my vote for the CWA, rather than rely on ESA or NEPA

C

Carolyn Yale  
US EPA Region 9  
Watersheds Office, WTR-3  
75 Hawthorne Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105

phone: 415-972-3482  
yale.carolyn@epa.gov